



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,292	09/26/2003	Paul Moroz	237539US6YA	6500
22850	7590	07/06/2005		EXAMINER
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			VORTMAN, ANATOLY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/670,292	MOROZ ET AL.
	Examiner Anatoly Vortman	Art Unit 2835

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Primary Examiner Anatoly Vortman / AU2835. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Edwin D. Garlepp, Reg. No. 45,330. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 30 June 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants presented amendments and arguments as indicated in the attached interview agenda. Applicants also explained the reasons why Claim 13 will be interpreted under 112, six paragraph. The amendments and arguments will overcome all objections and rejections of the May 3, 2005 Office action if the amendments shown to claim 1 is also implemented in claim 13. However, an updated search and consideration is needed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

**ANATOLY VORTMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**




Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

JUN. 29. 2005, 11:42AM OBLON SPIVAK

NO. 054 P. 1



**FACSIMILE**

PLEASE CALL US AT (703) 413-3000 IF THE MESSAGE YOU RECEIVE IS INCOMPLETE OR NOT LEGIBLE

ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314  
FRA  
(703) 413-3000  
(703) 413-2220 FACSIMILE  
OBLONPAT@OBLON.COM  
PATENT, TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT LAW  
AND RELATED FEDERAL AND ITC LITIGATION  
WWW.OBLON.COM

TO	Examiner Anatoly Vortman	6/29/05
	NAME	DATE
	U.S. PTO	571-273-2047
	COMPANY/FIRM	FAX #
	NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER: 3	CONFIRM FAX: <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
FROM	Edwin D. Garlepp	237539US8YA
	NAME	OUR REFERENCE
	703-412-5920	10/670,292
	DIRECT PHONE #	YOUR REFERENCE

**MESSAGE**

Examiner Vortman,

Further to our telephone discussion, attached please find a summary of the points for discussion in our personal interview. Please contact me for scheduling the personal interview.

Unless otherwise indicated or obvious from the nature of the transmittal, the information contained in this facsimile message is attorney privileged and confidential information intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error or are not sure whether it is privileged, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service at our expense. Thank You.

JUN. 29. 2005 11:42AM OBLON SPIVAK

NO. 054 P. 2

Interview Agenda for Application Serial No. 10/670,292

I. Applicants propose to amend Claim 1 as shown below.

Claim 1: A substrate holder for supporting a substrate, comprising:

an exterior supporting surface configured to support said substrate;

a cooling component positioned within an interior of the substrate holder;

a heating component positioned within said interior of the substrate holder adjacent to the supporting surface and between an opposite side of the supporting surface and the cooling component; and

a contact volume positioned between the heating component and the cooling component, and formed by a first internal surface and a second internal surface,

wherein a thermal conductivity between the heating component and the cooling component is increased when the contact volume is provided with a fluid.

This amendment is believed to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Moreover, the primary reference to Brzezinski does not show the features of amended Claim 1.

II. Regarding the objections to the drawings, Applicants propose to amend Claim 35 to eliminate any reference to the plasma. Applicants would also like to discuss how the Examiner wishes for the "external heat flux" and "heating component being absent" features to be shown in the drawings.

III. With regard to the rejection of Claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Applicants note that the specification explains that a "rough" surface is a polished surface that has undergone a roughening process, such as sandblasting. Applicants submit

JUN. 29. 2005 11:42AM OBLON SPIVAK

NO. 054 P. 3

that this explanation provides a sufficient standard for one of ordinary skill in the art to understand the meaning of a rough surface as opposed to a smooth surface.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Edwin D. Garlepp

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**